REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure as being so incomprehensible as to preclude a reasonable search of the prior art. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the various embodiments of the present invention are clearly described at least on pages 60-62 of the specification and in Figures 19A-C. Applicants request that the Examiner's objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-29 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner alleges that limitations involving first and second states, as well as the switching mechanism, are not supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the subject matter set forth in claims 1-29 is clearly described at least on pages 60-62 of the specification and in Figures 19A-C. Applicants request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-29 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner alleges that claims 1-29 include limitations that appear to claim different entities in a duplicate fashion, such as "a bridge" set forth in claim 1 and "a second bridge" set forth in claim 3. Applicants respectfully submit that "the bridge" and "the second bridge" are not the same element and therefore are not claimed in a duplicate fashion. For example, as shown in Figure 19B, the system may include a south bridge 330 and a north bridge 810. Applicants submit that claims 1-29 are definite and

request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-29 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Frank (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,489). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 sets forth a processor, a bridge coupled to the processor, and a memory selectably coupled to the bridge and the processor. Claim 1 also sets forth a switching mechanism coupled between the memory and each of the processor and the bridge, wherein the switching mechanism includes a first state providing access from the processor to the memory and a second state providing access from the bridge to the memory.

Frank describes a host microprocessor 332 that is coupled to a PCI bus 331 and a memory controller 339. The host microprocessor has an active state and an inactive state. In the inactive state, the host microprocessor 332 is prevented from accessing a memory array 340 by the memory controller 339. The host microprocessor 332 is always coupled to the local PCI bus 331 via a PCI bridge 333. See Frank, col. 5, ll. 6-30 and Figure 2. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Frank fails to describe or suggest switching mechanism includes a first state providing access from the processor to the memory and a second state providing access from the bridge to the memory. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not anticipated by Frank. Claims 2 and 4 depend on independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the

undersigned at (713) 934-4052 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/4/05

Mark W. Sincell, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 52,226
Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.
10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100
Houston, TX 77042
(713) 934-7000
(713) 934-7011 (Fax)

AGENT FOR APPLICANTS